

## FOREST SERVICE

### FY 1999 ANNUAL PROGRAM PERFORMANCE REPORT

Since passage of the Organic Administration Act of June 4, 1897, the Forest Service continues to provide leadership in the management, protection, and use of the Nation's forest, rangeland, and aquatic ecosystems. Today's National Forest System consists of 192 million acres in 44 states, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Through its research organization, the Forest Service remains a world leader in the discovery of solutions to natural resource related challenges in areas ranging from urban and tropical forestry to recreation management and forest product utilization. The State and Private Forestry organization works with State, local, and tribal governments and private landowners to help maintain and improve the health and productivity of the Nation's urban and rural forests and related economies.

The USDA Forest Service mission is *to sustain the health, productivity and diversity of the land to meet the needs of present and future generations*. The phrase "Caring for the Land and Serving People" expresses the spirit of this mission. Conserving and restoring the health of the land is the principle underlying every Forest Service program: Healthy land is fundamental to human well-being and to providing a sustainable flow of goods and services. This approach to management, where goods and services are provided within the capability of the resource base, is referred to as an "ecosystems approach" to land and water management or, more succinctly, ecosystems management.

Ecosystems management considers ecological, economic, and social factors in determining how best to maintain and enhance the quality of the environment to meet current and future needs for recreation, water, timber, minerals, fish, wildlife, and wilderness on national forest lands. It also involves collaboration with partners ranging from other Federal land management agencies to private individuals and groups in urban and rural areas across the country. Domestically and internationally, activities will be directed at developing values, products and services in such a way as to maintain ecosystems health. The agency will continue to develop and use the best available scientific information to facilitate achievement of our goals and objectives.

More information regarding the USDA Forest Service can be found in the Forest Service Strategic and Annual Performance Plans. Only federal employees were involved in the preparation of this report.

The following table provides summary information on USDA Forest Service achievement of FY 1999 Performance Goals.

FOREST SERVICE PERFORMANCE SUMMARY			
Strategic Goal	FY 1999 Performance Goals	Performance	
		Target	Actual
<b>Goal 1: Ensure Sustainable Ecosystems</b>	<b>1.1: Ensure Healthy and Diverse Aquatic Ecosystems</b>		
	Improve and protect wetland, riparian, and aquatic functions, processes, and associated values by restoring impaired soil and water conditions and improving inland and anadromous fish habitat in unsatisfactory condition:		
	Streams and lakes restored or enhanced for fish habitat:		
	a) inland stream miles	1,301	1,164
	b) anadromous stream miles	536	715
	c) inland lake acres	7,930	11,362
	d) anadromous lake acres	5,161	4,939
	Soil and water resource improvements – lands restored or enhanced (acres)	20,000	35,562
	Road decommissioning and stabilization (miles)	3,000	2,907
	Abandoned Mine Land (AML) watershed initiative activities	4	2
	Administer 60% of all energy and nonenergy mining operations to standard:		
	Bonded nonenergy/energy operations administered to standards:		
	a) number of operations	7,700	7,223
	b) percent of operations	60%	79%

FOREST SERVICE PERFORMANCE SUMMARY			
Strategic Goal	FY 1999 Performance Goals	Performance	
		Target	Actual
	<b>1.2: Ensure Healthy and Diverse Forestlands</b> Restore forested lands identified as needing restoration and use a variety of treatments to maintain, improve, and restore forested lands to ensure ecological integrity: Lands restored by reforestation (acres) Treatment of harvest related woody fuels – brush disposal (acres) Land ownership consolidation through acquisition and exchange (acres) Terrestrial wildlife habitat restored or enhanced (acres) Forestlands maintained or enhanced by stand improvement (acres) Hazardous fuels reduction (acres)	269,443 107,200 114,300 185,185 218,576 1,379,900	267,013 108,896 488,835 184,527 262,786 1,412,281
	Encourage restoration efforts on non-industrial private forest (NIPF) lands through Stewardship Management Plans, Stewardship practices, and watershed restoration activities: Non-Industrial Private Forests (NIPF) Stewardship Management Plans (number) NIPF lands under approved Stewardship Management Plans (acres) Multi-resource practices implemented on NIPF lands (acres) Legacy Project Acquisition (acres) Legacy Project Acquisition (projects) Statewide assessment of needs (states) Value of FEPP equipment loaned to States (million dollars) Forest health surveys and evaluations, Federal and Cooperative lands (million acres)	19,500 2,470,000 0 9,000 18 3 \$89.2 772	17,085 1,866,000 0 19,281 13 2 \$133.0 788
	<b>1.3: Ensure healthy and diverse Rangelands</b> Aggressively treat noxious weed infestations that pose a threat to rangeland health Noxious weeds treated (acres)	51,410	87,000
	Improve rangelands through non-structural improvements Nonstructural range improvements completed (acres)	29,930	28,123
	Restore NFS lands identified as needing work to improve rangelands to a condition that supports native and desirable non-native species as defined by land and resource management plan standards Rangelands monitored for progress toward desired condition in Allotment Management Plans (acres)	4,384,950	6,582,982
	<b>1.4: Respond to Hazardous Substance Sites</b> Restore and protect aquatic and terrestrial resources through hazardous substance site responses under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) Hazardous substance sites characterized Hazardous substance site cleanups completed Watershed or major abandoned mine land (AML) site cleanup actions initiated under CERCLA (also see objective 1.1)	54 17 3	21 29 15
	<b>1.5: Protect Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive (TE&amp;S) Species</b> Work with regulatory agencies and others to conserve species listed as threatened or endangered, or identified as sensitive Terrestrial TE&S habitat restored or enhanced (acres) Aquatic TE&S habitat restored or enhanced a) stream miles b) lake acres	113,547 179 93	82,247 315 45
	10 percent of the approximately 2,100 identified sensitive species will have a conservation agreement and/or strategy completed to guide resource management efforts Conservation agreements and strategies (number of sensitive aquatic and terrestrial species)	204	TBD
	Fully implement approved recovery plans for threatened and endangered species Approved and implemented recovery plans (number of listed aquatic and terrestrial species)	65	TBD

FOREST SERVICE PERFORMANCE SUMMARY			
Strategic Goal	FY 1999 Performance Goals	Performance	
		Target	Actual
	<b>1.6: Develop Scientific and Management Information to Support Sustainable Ecosystem Management</b> Provide forest-level integrated inventory on a 10-year cycle and assessments at several scales of resources on and affecting NFS lands to support formulation of policy, programs, and both forest-level and project decision-making Ecological assessments completed (number): a) Ecoregion (Domain/Division/Province) Scale b) Eco-subregion (Section/River Basin/Sub-basin) Scale c) Landscape/Watershed Scale Terrestrial Ecologic Unit Inventories (thousand acres) a) Eco-subregion (Section/Subsection) Scale b) Landscape Scale c) Land Unit Scale Aquatic Ecologic Unit Inventories a) Riverine Valley Segment (miles) b) Riverine Stream Reach/Channel Unit (miles) c) Lacustrine Lake Type Scale (acres) d) Lacustrine Lake Zone/Site Scale (acres) Biological Inventories (thousand acres) a) Forest Resource Inventories b) Rangeland Resource Inventory c) Wildlife Habitat Inventory d) TE&S Species Habitat Inventory Human Dimensions Inventory	2 17 113  1,395 5,784 15,186  36,756 1,954 36,829 782  36,378 4,789 1,828 2,309 849	2 19 169  18,669 17,276 7,874  12,149 1,646 7,074 20,113  22,536 2,944 2,905 4,440 1,571
	Monitor and evaluate forest and rangeland conditions relative to desired resource conditions consistent with the Criteria and Indicators for Sustainable Forest Management Air Quality Related Values Inventoried/Monitored (AQRVs)	521	998
	Develop and provide to managers scientific and technical information needed to manage and sustain the forest and rangelands of the Nation Scientific papers (number) Customer satisfaction survey with research information	1,192 NA	1,050 NA
	<b>1.7: Protect Natural Wilderness Ecosystem Related Values</b> Ensure that Congressionally designated wilderness and their associated ecosystems are influenced by natural processes from human-caused degradation Wilderness covered by approved fire plan (acres) Wilderness meeting Forest Plan standards for physical and social conditions (acres)	41,100 31,300	NA NA
	<b>Goal 2: Provide Multiple Benefits for People within the Capabilities of Ecosystems</b> <b>2.1: Provide Quality Recreation Experiences</b> Offer outstanding opportunities for solitude and primitive or unconfined outdoor recreation while reducing the backlog of trail reconstruction Trails reconstructed to standard Seasonal recreation capacity available (million persons at one time days) Annual wilderness & "Leave No Trace" education contacts	1,537 184.8 551,000	1,749 203.4 NA
	Provide additional recreation opportunities, including special uses such as outfitter, guide, and concessionaire operations Recreation special uses administered - number of permit	22,633	23,792
	Measure and improve on customer satisfaction with recreation experiences on NFS land Customer satisfaction survey with recreation special use permit Customer satisfaction survey with facilities, access, & information Customer satisfaction survey with Forest Service visitor centers	NA NA NA	NA NA NA
	<b>2.2: Provide for Heritage Resource Education and Use</b> Identify sites for future scientific evaluation, protection, and interpretation efforts Heritage sites evaluated (number of sites) Heritage sites interpreted (number of sites)	4,527 796	4,175 593
	Maintain visitor satisfaction through awareness and participation in inventory, site evaluation, restoration, and protection from vandalism Heritage sites preserved/protected (number of sites)	3,354	4,345

FOREST SERVICE PERFORMANCE SUMMARY			
Strategic Goal	FY 1999 Performance Goals	Performance	
		Target	Actual
	<b>2.3: Support Improved Urban Environments</b> Increase assistance to eligible communities to increase local capacities to assess, expand, and improve urban environments Participating communities (number) Technical assistance to communities (numbers) Training provided (million hours) Volunteer assistance generated (million hours)	 9,267 13,185 1.2 1.5	 11,101 11,020 1.4 1.2
	<b>2.4: Support Healthy and Diverse Rural Communities</b> Increase the number of assisted rural communities working under broad-based local strategic plans by 3 percent, in striving to reach the Strategic Plan's goal of 50 percent of all assisted communities operating under such plans by 2002 Communities working under broad-based local strategic plans (number) Communities using locally-based measurement systems Assistance to tribal and minority communities (number) Communities & volunteer fire departments assisted (number of grants) State foresters rate overall satisfaction with cooperative fire protection program	 850 355 190 2,391 NA	 740 429 195 2,450 est. NA
	<b>2.5: Provide for Sustainable Yield of Wood and Forest Products</b> Provide a sustainable supply of forest products from NFS lands and encourage and support other landowners to do the same Timber volume offered (million cubic feet) Timber volume sold (million cubic feet) Increased use of underutilized species (million cubic feet) Customer satisfaction survey with timber sale and contract program Customer satisfaction survey with special forest product permit system	 701.0 701.0 6.3 NA NA	 436.5 396.0 6.3 NA NA
	<b>2.6: Provide for Sustainable Grazing Use</b> Meet or move toward land and resource management plan objectives to support healthy native populations of wildlife, aquatic, and TE&S species Range structural improvements (number) Allotments administered to standard (number)	 1,198 4,389	 1,322 4,235
	Complete grazing allotments and implement NEPA decisions on schedule Grazing allotments analyzed and NEPA decisions signed (number) Customer satisfaction survey with grazing permit process	 718 NA	 464 NA
	<b>2.7: Support Ecologically Sound Minerals Production</b> Complete NEPA analyses in a timely manner, monitor operations, and ensure that mineral activities are done in an ecologically acceptable manner Bonded and non-bonded non-energy operations processed (number) Energy operations processed (number) Customer satisfaction survey with oil & gas leasing, drilling, and production permit program	 10,905 375 NA	 11,976 271 NA
	<b>2.8: Develop Scientific and Management Information to Support Improved Natural Resource Management and Use</b> Acquire, analyze, and interpret information needed to evaluate implementation of land and resource management plans Land and resource management plan monitoring and evaluation (number of plans) State of the region evaluation reports (number of reports)	 125 9	 94 7
	Interpret monitoring results and collect and analyze information to develop new land and resource management plans or revisions Land and resource management plan revisions, new plans initiated Land and resource management plan revisions, new plans completed	 14 2	 9 2
	Develop and provide to managers scientific and technical information needed to manage and sustain the forest and rangelands of the nation Technical reports (number) Inventory field plots remeasured (percent)	 1,526 6%	 1,455 6% est.

FOREST SERVICE PERFORMANCE SUMMARY			
Strategic Goal	FY 1999 Performance Goals	Performance	
		Target	Actual
	<b>2.9: Provide a Safe Environment for the Public and Employees on National Forest System Lands</b>	NA	NA
	<b>2.10: Provide for Special Uses and Protect National Forest System Land Title</b> Survey, mark, and maintain 10 percent of agency boundary lines to standard New boundary marked to standard (miles) Rights-of-way (cases)	1,050 342	1,028 332
	Be responsive to applications for new authorizations Special use permits processed	4,458	5,984
	Administer special use authorizations to meet public health and safety standards Permits administered to standard Hydropower license renewals	19,457 90	18,726 TBD
	Provide geometronics data for planning and management Revised primary base series quads maintained to standard (no.) Revised secondary base series quads maintained to standard (no.)	500 20	697 26
	<b>2.11: Provide for Safe Infrastructure and Access to National Forest System Lands</b> Maintain and restore existing infrastructure to protect capital investments where they provide safe, efficient and environmentally suitable support for agency activities and public use System roads maintained to standard (percent of total) Investments in existing roads (miles) Bridges inspected as scheduled Bridges constructed or maintained to improve sufficiency rating points Dams inspected as scheduled (percent) Facilities reconstructed or replaced to meet current legal standards (projects completed) Customer satisfaction survey with recreation related facilities & access	18% 2,774 90%  FY 98 +3 95%  32 NA	26% 3,558 NA NA NA 29 NA
	<b>Goal 3: Ensure Organizational Effectiveness</b> <b>3.1: An innovative, people-oriented work environment and workforce representative of society as a whole and that serves all customers equally</b> Minorities, women, and persons with disabilities in the workforce (percent of total) Minorities, women, and persons with disabilities in leadership positions (percent of positions GS-13 and above) Opportunities for increased participation (number served): Youth Conservation Corps Job Corps Senior Community Service Employment Program Implementation of USDA civil rights initiative (percent of related indicators) Employee participation in CIP survey (percent of workforce)		48.7% 34.5% 717 8,623 5,221 78.4% 46%
	<b>3.2: All customers received better service</b> Offer to all customers, contactors, suppliers and vendors opportunity to conduct electronic financial transactions Establish internal enterprise teams to improve management efficiency of National Forests in California Offer toll-free telephone, world-wide-web, and automated applications to all permittees and applicants of most frequently requested special use permits Improve service to public land users by providing one-stop shopping for information, permits, and other frequently requested over the counter products and services at BLM and Forest Service facilities Provide an integrated nationwide outdoor recreation information system that gives all Americans quick and easy access to the BLM, Park Service, and Forest Service, including recreation use permits and reservations	Emphasis on full implementation of IBM system. Evaluation of initial efforts Emphasis on full implementation of IBM system. Service first plans completed for each BLM district and FS forest. Evaluate, revise, and improve system.	Electronic payments by agency available. Evaluations completed. All but toll-free telephone access is available. "Service first" plans completed on a statewide basis. Access to system is available on internet at the interactive web site featuring user improvements made in FY 1999.

FOREST SERVICE PERFORMANCE SUMMARY			
Strategic Goal	FY 1999 Performance Goals	Performance	
		Target	Actual
	Customer satisfaction surveys completed (number)	5	5
	Follow-up analyses	NA	24
	<b>3.3: Integrated information systems, data structures and information management processes in place to support the agency's mission</b>		
	IBM system users (percent of employees)	100%	100%
	Mission critical systems tested and found to be Y2K compliant (percent of total)	100%	100%
	<b>3.4: A sound financial system which supports resource decisions with timely, accurate information and financial expertise</b>		
	FFIS implemented	3 pilot units	3 pilot units
	Real property inventory completed	Yes	Yes, partially
	Timber sales accounting system implemented	Yes	Yes
	Financial management reports developed showing obligations	Prototype	Partially
	direct/indirect costs and performance indicator costs	completed	completed
	Unqualified audit opinion	No	Audit not yet completed.
	Audit items from the Secretary's Management Report eliminated	No	Yes, partially
	Delinquent debts referred to Treasury for offset and cross-servicing (percent)	NA	NA
	<b>3.5: An effective and efficient administrative organization that supports the Forest Service Mission</b>	NA	

### Forest Service Performance Planning Transition Efforts

The Forest Service is making substantial changes to its budgeting, performance planning and reporting efforts. Two budgeting changes will affect how it manages and reports on various activities and results. The first is a change to *primary purpose* budgeting, which will affect funding levels in various line items but should have a minimal impact on program performance levels. The second is a change in the number of budget line items. Both of these changes will reduce complexity, improve management, and facilitate the ability to relate program results to budget levels.

Another important change that will occur in FY 2000 is revision to the Forest Service strategic plan. The strategic plan is a critical part of the changing management structure envisioned under the Government Performance and Results Act. It establishes long-term goals and objectives focusing on results and outcomes. The revised strategic plan (2000 Revision) is currently out for public review and will be finalized in September 2000.

The draft 2000 Revision focuses on outcomes or results to be achieved over a period of time. These outcomes will be achieved by managing the lands and resources of the National Forest System, delivering technical assistance through State and Private Forestry programs, making use of scientific information from Research and Development programs, and improving the management of and accountability for these activities. This focus on outcomes or long-term results, such as the health of the land, the quality of water, and customer satisfaction, represents an important change in focus for the USDA Forest Service.

The four goals of the draft 2000 Revision address ecosystem health, multiple benefits for people, scientific and technical assistance, and effective public service. Associated with each goal are objectives, strategies to achieve the objectives, and measures of progress. Collectively, these components of the strategic plan provide purpose and context for future management actions and investments, as well as a set of milestones for evaluating progress toward the goals. The measures and all information associated with them will be of audit quality.

Annual performance plans will address specific management actions and investments needed to ensure progress toward the goals and objectives of the strategic plan. Annual budget proposals will seek the

funding needed to deliver the annual actions and investments, as intended under the Results Act. Future program evaluations and performance reports will consider progress being made toward the long-term goals and objectives of the strategic plan. The efficacy of the selected long-term measures, as indicators of the results achieved, will also be evaluated in the future.

These changes should result in substantial improvement in how the Forest Service manages its programs and reports on results and accomplishments. Because the current strategic and annual performance plans does not have quantifiable milestones, the Forest Service has not been able to objectively evaluate the contribution of its annual accomplishments, as defined by the annual performance goals and measures, towards achieving either the strategic long-term goals or objectives. The revised Strategic Plan, once adopted, will lead to extensive changes in the Forest Service annual performance plan for FY 2001. The FY 2001 annual performance plan will contain a different set of performance measures. In addition, due to timing issues in finalizing the FY 2001 request as well as the changes in the budget format, targets for FY 2000 and FY 2001 reported in this document may not be consistent with those reported in the FY 2001 performance plan and budget justification. If differences occur, the performance plan and budget justification will contain more accurate targets.

### **FY 1999 Accomplishments Reported**

Forest Service accomplishments reported in this report represent key performance measures that, for the most part, are funded with appropriated dollars. In addition to these accomplishments, the forest service also conducts activities and achieves additional accomplishments by using trust fund dollars and by relying on efforts of other contributors, such as state and local governments, other organizations, or individual volunteers. Typically, performance targets are set only for accomplishments resulting from appropriated funds. Targets are not generally set for contributor efforts or trust fund activities because Forest Service program managers have less control over these resources. These additional accomplishments are not reported here to ensure a fair comparison with targets; since accomplishments are only set for appropriated dollars, only activities accomplished with appropriated dollars are shown. Any exceptions to this are noted in the report.

### **Crosscutting Data Issues**

Due to its decentralized structure and wide scope of programs and activities, the USDA Forest Service maintains several systems to track performance and provide management information. These include the following:

- Management Attainment Reporting (MAR) system used mainly for the National Forest System programs
- Performance Measures Accountability System (PMAS) used for State and Private Forestry to track cooperative forestry programs
- Research Budget Attainment Information System (RBAIS) used by Research and Development
- Wildlife, Fish, and Rare Plants (WFRP) used to track species and habitat programs
- Infrastructure database (INFRA) used to maintain and track information on Forest Service infrastructure assets

In addition to these systems, program staff track several of the performance indicators included in this report. Steps taken to validate and ensure quality control of data for specific measures or indicators will be discussed throughout the report.

RBAIS and WFRP apply to only a small set of indicators. They will be described under the objectives where those indicators are presented. The section below provides a general description of the data and some general concerns regarding the quality of data from MAR and PMAS used for performance indicators used throughout this report.

**MAR:** MAR is used to set performance targets toward the start of the fiscal year and report on accomplishments at the end of each fiscal year. Each Forest Service region is assigned an

accomplishment target for select MAR items after final appropriations and allocation decisions are made. Often, regions request mid-year adjustments to their MAR targets to reflect changes in priorities, needs, costs, or resources. These adjustments may occur after the final version of the Performance Plan is completed, which means MAR targets differ from Performance Plan targets included in this report. Forest Service field employees submit MAR data for district accomplishments through Forest Supervisors to their regional offices, where data are reviewed and aggregated for the region before being submitted to the Washington Office in electronic and paper format. Some indicators are only reported through MAR while others are included in other reports submitted by the fields or regions.

MAR data are submitted twice each year. In August, regions submit a 10-month report showing projected accomplishments. Then in November, regions submit a final report with actual accomplishments. The Washington Office usually receives final reports in mid to late November in both electronic and paper format. The electronic format consists of a spreadsheet with totals by region. These spreadsheets are fed into a database to generate national totals.

MAR submissions go through several layers of review, starting at the forest supervisor level, then through regional managers, and finally Washington Office review. During our GPRA report preparation process, the Forest Service identified several weaknesses in the MAR report process. Current checks are not sufficient to ensure that MAR data are complete, accurate, and consistent. We found cases of missing, incomplete, or inaccurate data, and discovered we do not have sufficient checks in place to ensure that our performance data from MAR are complete, accurate, and consistent with other data sources. We took steps to correct these problems when we identified them and the data contained in this report represent what we believe to be the best currently available. However, we know that weaknesses exist in our current data collection and reporting system. Consequently, we will undertake a more thorough review during FY 2000 to identify the sources of these problems and develop strategies to correct them to ensure improvements in our performance measures in the near future.

A separate issue involves definitions, both for MAR and other items as well. MAR measures have standard definitions for each data element. These definitions are distributed throughout the agency at all organizational levels with instructions that they are to be used by all data providers and managers to promote consistency. These definitions appear in Appendix C of the 1999 – 2000 GPRA Performance Plan. Questions on the definitions and measure may originate at all organizational levels, but ultimate responsibility for ensuring consistency in the interpretation of these definitions resides with the Washington office. Despite these efforts, data quality problems can still occur. Sources contributing to data quality problems include a lack of understanding of MAR item definitions by data providers and/or reviewers, how MAR items should be measured, and when accomplishments should be recorded.

**PMAS:** State and Private Forestry tracks performance measures related to its programs using the Performance Measures Accountability System (PMAS). PMAS data represents accomplishments for Cooperative Forestry programs throughout the United States. At the start of the fiscal year, Cooperative Forestry Regional Directors are provided with performance measures that require accomplishment reporting. Those indicators are shared with State Foresters who have the responsibility of making sure the data are collected at the local level. Data undergo several layers of review, beginning at the local level, moving to the state, regional, and finally the national level. Accomplishment data are kept in local databases and then provided to the regional and national level in hardcopy form. Accomplishment reports are due in the Washington office by the second week of November.

Currently, the Washington office is in the process of developing an electronic system that will facilitate data entry from the local level, allowing immediate access to the data at any time. The system will provide quarterly and mid-year status reporting and analysis, which should improve the Forest Service's ability to monitor, evaluate, and manage these programs.

**INFRA:** INFRA is a nationally deployed application providing integrated inventory of constructed features, roads, trails, and land units while automating several related business functions in financial management, acquisition management, and permits. The application will deliver reports on inventories, real property, and detailed reports on Forest Service deferred maintenance needs. It also contains

modules for billing, financial management, and other special uses. Separate modules of INFRA were released and installed on the IBM system during FY 1998 and 1999. Basic inventory data migrated from the earlier Data General system to the new IBM INFRA system as modules were developed and completed. INFRA 3.0, which contains data on several performance indicators, was released in July 1999. Since then, field units have been aggressively collecting deferred maintenance data, general inventory information, as well as other data used to manage all types of assets.

The Forest Service is now beginning the lengthy tasks associated with reviewing, validating, updating, and adding to existing information in INFRA. In some cases, field units have not fully populated some parts of INFRA. Field units have not yet entered certain data into the database, making it difficult or impossible to report some non-MAR items at this time. We expect over the next 1-2 years, data in INFRA will become more complete as field units enter specific information into the system. Management will provide additional guidance and impetus within targeted program areas in order for the Forest Service to provide better information about these various assets.

Further INFRA development and enhancements are ongoing with additional modules scheduled for implementation in FY 2000 and beyond. These new portions of the application will allow for expanded upward reporting of specific program data as well as providing ties to other systems such as the national reservation system and providing the field with business and inventory tools. Business function enhancements include interface with the Forest Service new financial information and accounting system for all real property transactions and permit billing, expanded GIS interface, and new and improved reporting capabilities via standard reports and through ad hoc Microsoft tools.

**Data Validation and Quality Review:** On-site reviews of organizational units and resource programs are the primary means of monitoring progress in meeting annual targets and moving towards strategic plan goals and objectives. A variety of reviews are conducted each fiscal year, with the level of detail depending on where it originates. For example, Washington Office (WO) reviews conducted by deputy chiefs concentrate on overall program operations while reviews initiated by forest supervisors tend to be much more detailed and can focus on a single activity within a program on a single ranger district. TES habitat improvement within the broader program area of Wildlife, Fish and Rare Plants is an example of an activity that might be reviewed at the forest supervisor level. Activity reviews can be initiated at all levels of the organization and are the most common because they examine the detailed operations that use personnel, capital, and information.

The Forest Service reviewed data in this report by checking it against other sources and having program leaders in the Washington office review data for possible errors. As part of this review, several errors were identified and corrected. Data displayed in this report represent the best currently available given the limited time for us to conduct this review. More importantly, we identified several opportunities to improve data collection and reporting procedures that should improve the quality and timeliness of data while reducing data collection burdens in the future. Some of these include using web-based data entry at the field level and developing a central warehouse for performance measurement data.

**Goal 1:** Ensure Sustainable Ecosystems.

**Objective 1.1:** Healthy, biologically diverse and resilient aquatic ecosystems restored and protected to maintain a variety of ecological conditions and benefits.

### Key Performance Goals

Improve and protect wetland, riparian, and aquatic functions, processes and associated values by restoring impaired soil and water conditions and improving inland and anadromous fish habitat in unsatisfactory condition

Streams and lakes restored or enhanced for fish habitat: inland stream miles

**Target:** 1,301

**Actual:** 1,164

Streams and lakes restored or enhanced for fish habitat: anadromous stream miles

**Target:** 536

**Actual:** 715

Streams and lakes restored or enhanced for fish habitat: inland lake acres

**Target:** 7,930

**Actual:** 11,362

Streams and lakes restored or enhanced for fish habitat: anadromous lake acres

**Target:** 5,161

**Actual:** 4,939

Soil and water resource improvements – lands restored or enhanced (acres)

**Target:** 20,000

**Actual:** 35,562

Road decommissioning and stabilization (miles)

**Target:** 3,000

**Actual:** 2,907

Abandoned Mine Land (AML) watershed initiative activities (non-CERCLA, also see Objective 1.4)

**Target:** 4

**Actual:** 2

Administer 60 percent of all energy and nonenergy mining operations to standard

Number of bonded nonenergy/energy operations administered to standards

**Target:** 7,700



**Actual:** 7,223


Percent of bonded nonenergy/energy operations administered to standards

**Target:** 60%

**Actual:** 79%

### Trend Data





	Actual					Targets		
	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	1999	2000	2001
Fish habitat restored or enhanced								
Stream miles, inland fish	864	1,121	950	911	1,164	1,301	1,275	1,405
Stream miles, anadromous fish	531	631	900	689	715	536	545	605
Total stream miles	1,395	1,752	1,850	1,600	1,879	1,837	1,820	2,010
Lake acres, inland fish	7,700	6,500	6,631	8,452	11,362	7,930	8,010	8,800
Lake acres, anadromous fish	5,000	1,300	3,713	1,086	4,939	5,161	5,675	5,630
Total lake acres	12,700	7,800	10,344	9,538	16,301	13,091	13,685	14,430
Road decommissioning, miles	2,126	1,440	1,787	2,099	2,907	3,000	2,500	2,500

**1999 Data:** Twelve measures were reported under objective 1.1 in the 1999 Revised Final Performance Plan. Nine measures are reported here, with the other three measures reported under objective 1.2. All indicators but one use data from the Forest Service Management Attainment Reporting (MAR) system. The indicator for abandoned mine land watershed initiative activities is tracked by the Watershed and Air program staff.

**Analysis of Results:** The Forest Service continues its work establishing baseline data to identify needs, including lands and fish habitat needing treatment. Although we do not have reliable baseline data to make a general statement whether we achieved the performance goals specified in the 1999 Performance Plan, we can compare our accomplishments to targets for performance indicators contained in the Plan. The Forest Service met or exceeded targets set for four of the nine indicators reported here.

- In two cases where reported accomplishment fell below the target, the shortfall in one indicator was more than offset by over-accomplishment in a related indicator. As the table above shows, the shortfall in stream miles for inland fish habitat was more than offset by anadromous fish habitat stream miles while the shortfall in lake acres of anadromous fish habitat was more than offset by inland fish habitat lake acres.
- The number of bonded nonenergy and total energy operations administered to standard was below the target, but the *percent* administered to standard exceeded the target because the total number of operations was below the level anticipated when the target was set. In 1999, 7,399 out of 9,189 operations were administered to standard. This indicator reflects whether Forest Service administered operations to comply with rules and regulations by conducting inspections to standard; it does not necessarily mean operators complied with environmental laws and regulations, however.
- Road decommissioning was below target by less than 100 miles, or 3 percent.

**Program Evaluations:** A March 1998 OIG audit titled Forest Service Wildlife and Fisheries Habitat Management identified two issues that could affect management of wildlife and fish habitat restoration efforts. The first is vacancies in leadership positions, and the second is insufficient management reviews of field operations. The audit remains open.

An OIG audit titled Management of Hazardous Waste at Active and Abandoned Mines was initiated in FY 1998 and closed in FY 1999. The Forest Service implemented various recommendations to improve inspections efforts. These efforts could prevent or identify potential hazardous waste problems earlier, reducing costs while preventing environmental damage. Audit recommendations have been completed.

**Goal 1:** Ensure Sustainable Ecosystems.

**Objective 1.2:** Ecological integrity of forested ecosystems restored or protected to maintain biological and physical components, functions, and interrelationships, and the capability for self-renewal.

### Key Performance Goals

Restore forested lands identified as needing restoration, and use a variety of treatments to maintain, improve, and restore forested lands to ensure ecological integrity

Lands restored by reforestation (acres)

**Target:** 269,443

**Actual:** 267,013

Treatment of harvest related woody fuels – brush disposal (acres)

**Target:** 107,200

**Actual:** 108,896

Land ownership consolidated through acquisition and exchange to facilitate restoration and protection (acres) \*

**Target:** 114,300

**Actual:** 488,835

Terrestrial wildlife habitat restored or enhanced (acres) \*

**Target:** 185,115

**Actual:** 184,527

Forestlands maintained or enhanced by stand improvement (acres)

**Target:** 218,576

**Actual:** 262,786

Hazardous fuels reduction (acres)

**Target:** 1,379,900

**Actual:** 1,412,281

Encourage restoration efforts on non-industrial private forest (NIPF) lands through Stewardship Management Plans, Stewardship Practices, and watershed restoration activities

NIPF Stewardship Management Plans

**Target:** 19,500

**Actual:** 17,085

NIPF lands under approved Stewardship Management Plans (acres) \*

**Target:** 2,470,000

**Actual:** 1,866,000

Multi-resource practices implemented on NIPF lands (acres) \*

**Target:** 0

**Actual:** 0

\* These measures contribute to multiple objectives. In the 1999 Revised Final Performance Plan, these measures were divided among several objectives by taking a percentage of each measure and applying it to the various objectives. While these measures continue to contribute to multiple objectives, the targets and accomplishments have been combined and are reported here because in each case the highest percent was assigned to objective 1.2. The measures along with the multiple objectives and percent of target assigned to each objective is as follows:

- Land ownership consolidation: 30% to objective 1.1, 40% to objective 1.2, and 30% to objective 1.3
- Terrestrial wildlife habitat restored or enhanced: 75% to objective 1.2, 25% to objective 1.3
- NIPF lands under approved Stewardship Management Plans: 5% to objective 1.1, 60% to objective 1.2, 5% to objective 2.1, and 30% to objective 2.5
- Multi-resource practices implemented on NIPF lands: 5% to objective 1.1, 50% to objective 1.2, 5% to objective 2.1, and 40% to objective 2.5

## Legacy Project Acquisition (acres)

**Target:** 9,000**Actual:** 19,281

## Legacy Project Acquisition (projects)

**Target:** 18**Actual:** 13

## Statewide assessment of needs (states)

**Target:** 3**Actual:** 2






## Value of FEPP equipment loaned to States (million dollars)

**Target:** \$89.2**Actual:** \$133.0

## Forest health surveys and evaluations, Federal and Cooperative lands (million acres)

**Target:** 772**Actual:** 788

## Trend Data



	Actual					Targets		
	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	1999	2000	2001
Terrestrial wildlife habitat restored or enhanced (1000 acres)	108	105	206	167	185	185	175	273
Hazardous Fuel Reduction (1000 acres)	570	617	1,098	1,489	1,412	1,380	1,320	1,345
Forest health surveys & evaluations (million acres)	657	661	772	788	788	772	788	788
NIPF lands under approved management plans (1000 acres)	2,339	2,084	2,144	1,931	1,866	2,470	1,905	1,773
Multi-resource practices on NIPF lands (1000 acres)	538	491	215	250	0	0	0	53

**1999 Data:** Fourteen performance indicators were reported under objective 1.2 in the 1999 Revised Final Performance Plan. The first six performance indicators listed above use data from the Forest Service MAR system:

- Lands restored by reforestation (acres)
- Treatment of harvest related woody fuels – brush disposal (acres)
- Fragmented land ownership consolidation through acquisition and exchange to facilitate restoration and protection (acres)
- Terrestrial wildlife habitat restored or enhanced (acres)
- Forestlands maintained or enhanced by stand improvement (acres)
- Hazardous fuels reduction (acres)

The next six indicators use data from State and Private Forest PMAS:

- NIPF Stewardship Management Plans (number of plans)
- Non-industrial Private Forest (NIPF) lands under approved Stewardship Management Plans (acres)
- Multi-resource practices implemented on NIPF lands (acres)
- Legacy Project Acquisition (acres)
- Legacy Project Acquisition (number of projects)
- Statewide assessment of needs (number of states)

The last two measures – forest health surveys and evaluations on federal and cooperative lands, and value of fire equipment loaned to states – are tracked by State and Private Forestry staff separate from MAR and PMAS.

Two of the MAR indicators – lands restored by reforestation and forestlands maintained or enhanced by stand improvement – are also tabulated in an automated timber stand record-keeping system maintained in each region. At the end of the year, stand records are aggregated and reported upward to develop national totals. These totals are used to audit the MAR reports and make corrections where necessary. The figures reported here represent the final audited numbers for these indicators.

**Analysis of Results:** Current efforts to inventory and survey Federal and non-Federal forestland will continue in FY 2000. Although we do not have reliable baseline data to make a general statement whether we achieved the performance goals specified in the 1999 Performance Plan, we can compare our accomplishments to targets for performance indicators contained in the Plan. The Forest Service met or exceeded seven performance indicator targets and fell short on seven. The targets missed include the following:

- Targets set for two indicators – lands restored by reforestation and terrestrial wildlife habitat restored or enhanced – were missed by less than 1%.
- Several factors contributed to the Stewardship Management Plan target shortfalls. Some states shifted money away from plans into other activities allowed under this program, such as nursery improvement activities and general education and outreach efforts. Planning cost increases also affected acres covered. Finally, some states may have underreported acres by not including acres in category 1 watersheds also covered by Clean Water Action Plan reporting requirements.

- Although the Forest Service did fewer legacy project acquisitions (13 instead of 18), it exceeded the target for acres acquired by 10,281 or 114%.

**Description of Actions and Schedules:** Stewardship targets have been adjusted to reflect FY 2000 appropriations and FY 2001 budget requests. Forest health surveys and evaluation targets have been adjusted to reflect past year accomplishments.

**Current Fiscal Year Performance:** See above.

**Program Evaluations:** The USDA OIG has conducted several audits on land exchanges and acquisitions. One of these audits completed in FY 1999 covered the Tahoe basin. The Forest Service has not yet completed analysis and plans to implement recommendations from these audits. Furthermore, GAO has initiated a national review of the land acquisition and exchange program.

In August 1998, the USDA OIG released an audit of the Stewardship Incentive Program identifying cases where program implementation did not follow policies already in place. The Forest Service adopted several recommendations to remedy this. This audit is closed.

**Goal 1:** Ensure Sustainable Ecosystems.

**Objective 1.3:** Healthy, diverse and resilient rangeland ecosystems restored and protected to maintain robust riparian systems, a variety of ecological conditions and benefits, and biodiversity.

### Key Performance Goals

#### Aggressively treat noxious weed infestations that pose a threat to rangeland health

Noxious weeds treated (acres)

**Target:** 51,410  
**Actual:** 87,000

#### Improve rangelands through nonstructural improvements such as seeding, fertilizing, and liming

Nonstructural range improvements completed (acres)



**Target:** 29,930  
**Actual:** 28,123

#### Restore NFS lands identified as needing work to improve rangelands to a condition that supports native and desirable non-native species as defined by land and resource management plan standards

Rangelands monitored for progress toward desired condition in Allotment Management Plans (acres)

**Target:** 4,384,950  
**Actual:** 6,582,982

### Trend Data



	Actual					Targets		
	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	1999	2000	2001
Noxious weeds treated: acres	29,949	36,101	72,357	75,138	87,000	51,410	56,000	85,000
Nonstructural range improvements: acres	27,002	41,699	36,856	23,817	28,123	29,930	32,000	28,690

**1999 Data:** Three performance indicators for this objective use data from the Forest Service Management Attainment Reporting (MAR) system.

**Analysis of Results:** Current Forest Service efforts to work on rangeland inventory and survey will help establish the necessary baseline data for this objective. Although we do not have reliable baseline data to make a general statement whether we achieved the performance goals specified in the 1999 Performance Plan, we can compare our accomplishments to targets for rangeland performance indicators contained in the 1999 Revised Final Performance Plan. The Forest Service significantly exceeded targets for two of the three performance indicators under this objective, while missing the target for nonstructural range improvements by 6 percent. The work performed for rangeland non-structural improvements includes the use of controlled burns. Weather and site conditions influence the accomplishment of this target. Variations due to external factors cannot be planned in advance.

In addition to the accomplishments reported for noxious weed treatment using appropriated funds, an additional 9,780 acres were treated through cooperative efforts from state and local governments.

**Program Evaluations:** None

**Goal 1:** Ensure Sustainable Ecosystems.

**Objective 1.4:** Healthy, diverse and resilient aquatic and terrestrial resources restored and protected through hazardous substances sites response.

#### Key Performance Goals

Restore and protect aquatic and terrestrial resources through hazardous substance site responses under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA)

Hazardous substance sites characterized

**Target:** 54

**Actual:** 21

Hazardous substance site cleanups completed

**Target:** 17

**Actual:** 29

Watershed or major abandoned mine land (AML) site cleanup actions initiated under CERCLA

**Target:** 3

**Actual:** 15

**1999 Data:** Data for these three performance indicators are collected and monitored by Forest Service Engineering staff.

Hazardous substance sites characterized are sites where a determination is made of: physical, chemical, and biological conditions; pertinent environmental and ecological parameters; contaminant identification; potential pathways for receptor exposure or environmental impact; natural resource damage; restoration actions; potential responsible parties and trustees; and, cost associated with these activities including potentially injured resource costs. Environmental management staff maintains these data.

Hazardous substance site cleanups completed is the completion of planned and systematic restoration activities to include: reduction of relative risk; having remedies in place; mitigation of natural resource damages; and, restoration of the damaged natural resources to an ecological functioning system. Environmental management staff maintains these data.

Watershed or major abandoned mine land site cleanup actions initiated under CERCLA show the number of actions under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA). The Forest Service is responsible for overseeing all nonemergency investigations and

cleanups of hazardous sites on NFS lands. Hazardous sites under CERCLA include abandoned landfills and mines, oil and gas exploration sites, and drug lab or other illegal dumps.

**Analysis of Results:** The Forest Service exceeded its targets for two of the three indicators – hazardous substance site cleanups completed and watershed or major abandoned mine land site cleanup actions initiated under CERCLA – but fell short of its target for hazardous substance sites characterized due to inadequate levels of qualified staff to conduct this work.

**Program Evaluations:** A GAO report titled Superfund: Progress Made by EPA and Other Federal Agencies to Resolve Program Management Issues reviewed interagency efforts to implement environmental cleanups on Forest Service lands. As a result of this review, the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, and other agencies entered into a Memorandum of Understanding to improve coordination among participating agencies. This audit has been closed.

**Goal 1:** Ensure Sustainable Ecosystems.

**Objective 1.5:** Populations of threatened endangered, and sensitive (TE&S) species are conserved through recovery and management efforts.

### Key Performance Goals

Work with regulatory agencies and others to conserve species listed as threatened or endangered, or identified as sensitive

Terrestrial TE&S habitat restored or enhanced (acres)

**Target:** 113,547

**Actual:** 82,247

Aquatic TE&S habitat restored or enhanced: stream miles

**Target:** 179

**Actual:** 315

Aquatic TE&S habitat restored or enhanced: lake acres

**Target:** 93

**Actual:** 64

10 percent of the approximately 2,100 identified sensitive species will have a conservation agreement and/or strategy completed to guide resource management efforts

Conservation agreements and strategies (number of sensitive aquatic and terrestrial species)

**Target:** 204

**Actual:** TBD



Fully implement approved recovery plans for threatened and endangered species




Approved and implemented recovery plans (number of listed aquatic and terrestrial species)

**Target:** 65

**Actual:** TBD

### Trend Data





	Actual					Targets		
	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	1999	2000	2001
Terrestrial TE&S habitat restored or enhanced: land acres	75,700	53,900	122,280	201,966	82,247	113,547	107,000	143,000
Aquatic TE&S habitat restored or enhanced: stream miles	61	130	161	243	315	179	215	275
Aquatic TE&S habitat restored or enhanced: lake acres	309	177	118	134	64	93	80	110
Conservation agreements: number of species	NA	NA	70	100	TBD	204	235	219
Recovery plans: number of listed species	NA	NA	182	200	TBD	65	72	78

**1999 Data:** The first three performance indicators under this objective are from MAR.

The other two indicators – conservation agreements and number of listed species covered by recovery plans – use data from the Wildlife, Fish, and Rare Plants (WFRP) database. At the end of each fiscal year, field employees submit program data and project narratives for items tracked in the WFRP database to regional office program leaders for these programs. The data are reviewed and entered into an oracle database. The data is then retrieved from each regional database and merged into a national database at the Washington Office. A final validation process is used at the WO before the data is used to respond to Congress, administration, and partners. Standard definitions for each data element are available to all field employees via the National WFRP Website. These definitions are provided to ensure consistency across organizational levels. FY 1999 data for these two measures were not available in time for this report, but should be available in Spring 2000.

**Analysis of Results:** Although many targets were exceeded and many were not attained, the Forest Service is unable to make a general statement whether performance goals were met.

**Description of Actions and Schedules:** In FY2000, the WFRP database will be redesigned into a web application.

**Program Evaluations:** None.

**Goal 1:** Ensure Sustainable Ecosystems.

**Objective 1.6:** Better ecosystem management decisions based on the best available scientific and management information.

### Key Performance Goals

Provide forest-level integrated inventory on a 10-year cycle and assessments at several scales of resources on and affecting NFS lands to support formulation of policy, programs, and both forest-level and project decision-making

Ecological assessments completed (number): Ecoregion (Domain/Division/Province) Scale

**Target:** 2

**Actual:** 2

Ecological assessments completed (number): Eco-subregion (Section/River Basin/Sub-basin) Scale

**Target:** 17

**Actual:** 19

Ecological assessments completed (number): Landscape/Watershed Scale

**Target:** 113

**Actual:** 169

Terrestrial Ecologic Unit Inventories (thousand acres): Eco-subregion (Section/Subsection) Scale

**Target:** 1,395

**Actual:** 18,669

Terrestrial Ecologic Unit Inventories (thousand acres): Landscape Scale

**Target:** 5,784

**Actual:** 17,276

Terrestrial Ecologic Unit Inventories (thousand acres): Land Unit Scale

**Target:** 15,186

**Actual:** 7,874

Aquatic Ecologic Unit Inventories: Riverine Valley Segment (miles)

**Target:** 36,756

**Actual:** 12,149

Aquatic Ecologic Unit Inventories: Riverine Stream Reach/Channel Unit (miles)

**Target:** 1,954

**Actual:** 1,646

Aquatic Ecologic Unit Inventories: Lacustrine Lake Type Scale (acres)

**Target:** 36,829

**Actual:** 7,074

Aquatic Ecologic Unit Inventories: Lacustrine Lake Zone/Site Scale (acres)

**Target:** 782

**Actual:** 20,113

Biological Inventories (thousand acres): Forest Resource Inventories

**Target:** 36,378

**Actual:** 22,536

Biological Inventories (thousand acres): Rangeland Resource Inventory

**Target:** 4,789

**Actual:** 2,944

Biological Inventories (thousand acres): Wildlife Habitat Inventory

**Target:** 1,828

**Actual:** 2,905

Biological Inventories (thousand acres): TE&S Species Habitat Inventory

**Target:** 2,309

**Actual:** 4,440

Human Dimensions Heritage Inventory (thousand acres)

**Target:** 849

**Actual:** 1,571

Monitor and evaluate forest and rangeland conditions relative to desired resource conditions consistent with the Criteria and Indicators for Sustainable Forest Management

Air Quality Related Values Inventoried/Monitored (AQRVs)

**Target:** 521

**Actual:** 998

Develop and provide to managers scientific and technical information needed to manage and sustain the forest and rangelands of the Nation

Scientific papers (number)

**Target:** 1,192

**Actual:** 1,050

Customer satisfaction survey with research information

**Target:** NA

**Actual:** NA

**1999 Data:** The FY 1999 Performance Plan included 18 performance measures. The first sixteen, shown above, use data from the Forest Service Management Attainment Reporting (MAR) system. The indicator for scientific papers uses data from the Research Budget Attainment Information System (RBAIS). The last indicator is from customer satisfaction surveys to be conducted every three years of special permit users. This survey was not scheduled for FY 1999, so data are not available for this indicator.

The number of scientific papers comes from the Research Budget Attainment Information System (RBAIS) maintained by Forest Service Research and Development. RBAIS tracks funding and attainment at the Research Work Unit (RWU) level. At the beginning of the year, Research and Development funding is allocated to Research Stations based on Congressional direction. Each station then allocates funding to RWUs. Each RWU submits data on attainment to the Research Station budget coordinator. The data are reviewed by Station Assistant Directors and then forwarded to the National Budget Coordinator and the Research and Development Staffs in the Washington office. The Research Staffs review the data, prioritize accomplishments, and provide input to the Budget Coordinator on the annual RBAIS Report. The Research and Development Budget Coordinator organizes the data into a final report that is incorporated into the USDA Forest Service annual report. Data quality problems occur infrequently, and when they do, they are centered on revisions made to RBAIS. The RBAIS measure for scientific papers includes books, papers in series, journal articles, dissertations and theses, and other similar peer-reviewed accomplishments that are primarily related to ecosystem sustainability.

**Analysis of Results:** The Forest Service met or exceeded the target for 10 of the Inventory and Monitoring measures and failed to meet targets set for 7 measures. In most cases, targets were missed due to mid-year changes in priorities, which shifted the types or scale of inventory. Overall, the combined target for acres inventoried was less than 1% below the target.

Among the Terrestrial Ecological Unit Inventories, acres inventoried were shifted among Eco-subregion, Landscape, and Land Unit scale. In some regions, these changes supported Land and Resource Management Plan revisions and watershed assessments by preparing basic inventories and completing core GIS coverage. In addition, additional acres were inventoried through cooperative efforts with other agencies and tribes.

The Forest Service did not meet its target for number of scientific papers in FY 1999. Several factors contributed to this shortfall, including the long-term nature of scientific research, the nature of the process of publishing research results, and the net loss of scientists in the R&D organization all contribute to this shortfall. Research is a long-term process, with results submitted for publication late in the study cycle. Predicting when results will be published is difficult, causing publication output to vary significantly across years due to journal publication cycles, the length of the peer review process, the workload of station and journal editors, and the actual progress of field studies. Consequently, this shortfall is well within the uncertainty inherent in making such estimates in advance.

**Description of Actions and Schedules:** The Forest Service will be revising the definitions of various inventory indicators. For further detail, see the 2000 Revised Final/2001 Final Performance Plan.

**Program Evaluations:** Several USDA OIG and GAO audits and evaluations are currently being conducted to review inventory and land management planning efforts. In May 1999, GAO issued a report titled Ecosystem Planning – Northwest Forest and Interior Columbia River Basin Plans Demonstrate Improvements in Land Use Planning. This report recommended, among other things, paying more attention to ecological and socioeconomic trade-offs and providing land managers with clear direction for implementation combined with performance standards to improve accountability. The Forest Service has developed a response to these recommendations.

**Goal 1:** Ensure Sustainable Ecosystems.

**Objective 1.7:** Naturally functioning wilderness ecosystems where conditions are determined primarily by natural forces.

#### Key Performance Goals

Ensure that Congressionally designated wilderness and their associated ecosystems are influenced primarily by natural processes and protected from human-caused degradation

Wilderness covered by approved fire plan (acres)

**Target:** 41,100

**Actual:** NA

Wilderness meeting Forest Plan standards for physical and social conditions (acres)

**Target:** 31,300

**Actual:** NA

**1999 Data:** These were new indicators, and no data were collected in FY 1999.

**Analysis of Results:** No data were available for analysis.

**Description of Actions and Schedules:** During FY 2000, the Forest Service will explore options for collecting data on these measures.

**Current Fiscal Year Performance:** Indicators have not yet been developed to measure current fiscal year performance.

**Program Evaluations:** None.

**Goal 2:** Provide Multiple Benefits for People within the Capabilities of Ecosystems.

**Objective 2.1:** Quality recreation experiences with minimal impacts to ecosystem stability and condition.

### Key Performance Goals

Offer outstanding opportunities for solitude and primitive or unconfined outdoor recreation while reducing the backlog of trail reconstruction

Trails reconstructed to standard:

**Target:** 1,537

**Actual:** 1,749

Seasonal recreation capacity available: million persons at one time (PAOT) days

**Target:** 184.8

**Actual:** 203.4

Annual wilderness & "Leave No Trace" education contacts

**Target:** 551,000

**Actual:** NA

Provide additional recreation opportunities, including special uses such as outfitter, guide, and concessionaire operations

Recreation special uses administered: number of permits

**Target:** 22,633

**Actual:** 23,792

Measure and improve on customer satisfaction with recreation experiences on NFS land

Customer satisfaction survey with recreation special use permit

**Target:** NA

**Actual:** NA

Customer satisfaction survey with facilities, access, & information

**Target:** NA



**Actual:** NA


Customer satisfaction survey with Forest Service visitor centers

**Target:** NA

**Actual:** NA

### Trend Data





	Actual					Targets		
	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	1999	2000	2001
Trails reconstructed to standard - miles	2,139	1,696	1,674	2,150	1,749	1,537	1,749	1,750
Seasonal recreation capacity - mil. PAOT	163	157	194	201	203	185	210	215
Recreation special uses administered – number of permits	16,681	22,522	27,130	23,000	23,792	22,633	23,700	23,500

**1999 Data:** The FY 1999 Revised Final Performance Plan contained ten performance indicators for objective 2.1. Seven are reported here. Two changes account for this difference. First, the 1999 plan divided the indicator for trails reconstructed to standard between wilderness and non-wilderness. These are combined in this report. Second, two measures – NIPF lands under approved Stewardship Management Plans and multi-resource practices implemented on NIPF lands – contribute to and were split among multiple objectives in the plan. While they continue to contribute this objective, these measures are reported under objective 1.2 (see the footnote under objective 1.2 for more information).

The first three indicators – trails reconstructed to standard, seasonal recreation capacity available, and recreation special uses administered to standard – use data from the Forest Service Managements Attainment Reporting (MAR) system. The Forest Service does not have a system to collect data on Wilderness and “Leave-No-Trace” education contacts, so no data will be available for this measure for 1999. Also, no customer satisfaction surveys were scheduled for or conducted during FY 1999.

**Analysis of Results:** The Forest Service exceeded its targets for trails reconstructed to standard, seasonal recreation capacity, and recreation special uses administered to standard.

**Description of Actions and Schedules:** During FY 2000, the Forest Service will examine whether it is feasible to collect data on Wilderness and “Leave-No-Trace” education contacts or determine if another measure is more appropriate.

**Current Fiscal Year Performance:** FY 2000 targets were adjusted upward for seasonal recreation capacity.

**Program Evaluations:** GAO has several ongoing audits on various recreation programs, but none appear directly related to these indicators.

**Goal 2:** Provide Multiple Benefits for People within the Capabilities of Ecosystems.

**Objective 2.2:** Protected and restored heritage resources that are available for the education and use of current and future generations.

### Key Performance Goals

#### Identify sites for future scientific evaluation, protection and interpretation efforts

Heritage Sites Evaluated (Sites)

**Target:** 4,527

**Actual:** 4,175

Heritage Sites Interpreted (Sites)

**Target:** 796

**Actual:** 593




#### Maintain visitor satisfaction through awareness and participation in inventory, site evaluation, restoration, and protection from vandalism

Heritage sites preserved/protected

**Target:** 3,354

**Actual:** 4,345

### Trend Data



	Actual				Targets		
	1996	1997	1998	1999	1999	2000	2001
Heritage sites evaluated	2,817	2,219	4,945	4,175	4,527	3,800	2,000
Heritage sites interpreted	492	793	538	593	796	550	400
Heritage sites preserved/protected	2,394	2,968	6,795	4,345	3,354	3,200	2,000

**1999 Data:** The three performance indicators for objective 2.2 use data from the Forest Service Management Attainment Reporting (MAR) system.

**Analysis of Results:** The Forest Service fell short of its target for the number of heritage sites evaluated and interpreted, but exceeded its target for sites preserved or protected.

**Goal 2:** Provide Multiple Benefits for People within the Capabilities of Ecosystems.

**Objective 2.3:** Improved urban environments and enhanced community livability through healthy landscapes.

### Key Performance Goals

Increase assistance to eligible communities to increase local capacities to assess, expand, and improve urban environments

Participating communities (number)

**Target:** 9,267

**Actual:** 11,101

Technical assistance to communities (number)

**Target:** 13,185

**Actual:** 11,020

Training provided (million hours)

**Target:** 1.2


**Actual:** 3.8

Volunteer assistance generated (million hours)

**Target:** 1.5

**Actual:** 1.2

### Trend Data



	Actual			Targets		
	1997	1998	1999	1999	2000	2001
Participating communities	10,110	9,635	11,101	9,267	10,000	12,850

**1999 Data:** The four performance indicators for objective 2.3 use data from the Forest Service Performance Measures Accountability System (PMAS).

**Analysis of Results:** The Forest Service had mixed results for this objective. Targets for participating communities and hours of training provided were exceeded, while technical assistance to communities and volunteer assistance generated was below targets set for these indicators.

**Description of Actions and Schedules:** The FY 2001 target for participating communities has been raised. In FY2000 the Forest Service will be refining the method of measuring performance reporting for technical and volunteer assistance.

**Current Fiscal Year Performance:** Depending on the nature of changes in reporting methodology, FY2000 data for technical and volunteer assistance may not be comparable with prior year data.

**Program Evaluations:** GAO has an ongoing evaluation examining the socio-economic impact of Forest Service programs on urban communities. A report has not yet been issued.

**Goal 2:** Provide Multiple Benefits for People within the Capabilities of Ecosystems.

**Objective 2.4:** Economically healthy and diversified rural communities operating under strategic plans for sustainable development.

### Key Performance Goals

Increase the number of assisted rural communities working under broad-based local strategic plans by 3 percent, in striving to reach the Strategic Plan's goal of 50 percent of all assisted communities operating under such plans by 2002

Communities working under broad-based strategic plans (number)

**Target:** 850

**Actual:** 740

Communities using locally-based measurement systems

**Target:** 355

**Actual:** 429

Assistance to tribal and minority communities

**Target:** 190

**Actual:** 195

Communities and volunteer fire departments assisted (number)

**Target:** 2,391


**Actual:** 2,450 *Preliminary estimate*

State foresters rate overall satisfaction with cooperative fire protection program

**Target:** NA

**Actual:** NA

### Trend Data



	Actual			Targets		
	1997	1998	1999	1999	2000	2001
Communities working under broad-based local strategic plans	538	690	740	850	775	800

**1999 Data:** The first three indicators for this objective use data from the Forest Service Performance Measures Accountability System (PMAS). The fourth indicator – Communities and volunteer fire departments assisted – use data from reports submitted by each state on the number of grants they made during the year. These data are submitted to the Forest Service in January of the following fiscal year. Complete data were not available in time for this report, but should be available by February. The estimate is a projection based on about 70% of the states reporting. The fifth measure – State Forester's overall satisfaction with the Cooperative Fire Protection Program – depends on surveys conducted on a two to three year cycle. No survey was scheduled for or conducted in FY 1999.

**Analysis of Results:** Although the Forest Service increased the number of communities working under broad-based strategic plans, it did not achieve its target of 850 set for FY1999. The targets for the other

four indicators were exceeded, however. Rural communities use broad-based local strategic plans to develop strategies for achieving sustainable development through the Economic Action Programs.

**Description of Actions and Schedules:** In FY 2000, the Forest Service will work with State Foresters to improve identification of communities that received technical and financial assistance through the cooperative fire program.

**Current Fiscal Year Performance:** If measurement definitions or data collections change in FY 2000, data for FY 2000 may not be comparable to prior year data.

**Program Evaluations:** See objective 2.3.

**Goal 2:** Provide Multiple Benefits for People within the Capabilities of Ecosystems.

**Objective 2.5:** A sustainable yield of forest products that contributes to meeting the Nation's demands and to restoring, improving or maintaining forest ecosystem health.

### Key Performance Goals

Provide a sustainable supply of forest products from NFS lands and encourage and support other landowners to do the same

Timber volume offered (million cubic feet)

**Target:** 701.0

**Actual:** 436.5

Timber volume sold (million cubic feet)

**Target:** 701.0

**Actual:** 396.0

Increased use of underutilized species (million cubic feet)

**Target:** 6.3

**Actual:** 6.3

Customer satisfaction survey with timber sale and contract program

**Target:** NA



**Actual:** NA

Customer satisfaction survey with special forest product permit system

**Target:** NA

**Actual:** NA

### Trend Data



	Actual					Targets		
	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	1999	2000	2001
Timber volume offered	535	749	762	646	437	701	699	608
Timber volume sold	540	509	791	570	396	701	699	608

**1999 Data:** The FY 1999 Performance Plan included seven measures for this objective. Only five are reported here because NIPF lands under approved Stewardship Management Plans and multi-resource practices implemented on NIPF lands, although contributing to this objective, are reported under objective 1.2. See the footnote under objective 1.2 for more information.

Of the five measures shown in the table above, the first two – timber volume offered and timber volume sold – are reported through MAR. Data for increased use of underutilized species (million cubic feet) are from PMAS. The last two indicators use data from satisfaction surveys. No surveys were scheduled for FY 1999.

**Analysis of Results:** The Forest Service fell short of its targets on timber volume offered and timber volume sold. Several factors contributed to these shortfalls. A lack of sufficient water-based marking paint during the field season combined with appeals and wildlife consultation issues delayed sale preparation and offer. In addition, litigation affected the President's plan for the Pacific Northwest targets by requiring additional survey protocols for Survey and Manage species. Finally, some no-bid sales contributed to the shortfall.

**Description of Actions and Schedules:** Funds have been designated for FY 2000 to develop a better mechanism for collecting data on use of underutilized species.

**Current Fiscal Year Performance:** The timber volume offered and volume sold shortfalls will not affect FY 2000 or beyond targets. In some cases, offer volume delayed or not bid on in FY 1999 will be offered for sale in FY 2000.

**Program Evaluations:** The USDA OIG conducted audits on timber sale environmental analysis requirements. The Forest Service adopted several recommendations from this audit. GAO also issued a report in June 1999 titled Forest Service Priorities: Evolving Mission Favors Resource Protection over Production that addresses trends in timber sales. The audit remains open.

**Goal 2:** Provide Multiple Benefits for People within the Capabilities of Ecosystems.

**Objective 2.6:** A sustainable supply of forage on suitable and capable lands for livestock and wildlife.

#### Key Performance Goals

Meet or move toward land and resource management plan objectives to support healthy native populations of wildlife, aquatic and TE&S species

Range structural improvements (number)

**Target:** 1,198

**Actual:** 1,322

Allotments administered to standard (number)

**Target:** 4,389

**Actual:** 4,235

Complete grazing allotments and implement NEPA decisions on schedule

Grazing allotments analyzed and NEPA decision signed (number)

**Target:** 718



**Actual:** 464

Customer satisfaction survey with grazing permit process

**Target:** NA

**Actual:** NA

## Trend Data



	Actual					Targets		
	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	1999	2000	2001
Range structural improvements – number	1,603	2,145	1,718	1,370	1,322	1,198	1,100	1,091
Grazing allotments analyzed and NEPA decisions signed – number	NA	664	621	790	464	718	690	559

**1999 Data:** All indicators except for the customer satisfaction survey use MAR data. No surveys were scheduled or conducted for FY 1999, so data are not available for this indicator.

**Analysis of Results:** The Forest Service does not have quantifiable goals in place for this objective. As a result, we are not able to say whether we met performance goals in FY 1999. However, targets were in place for three of the four measures. The Forest Service exceeded its target for the number of range structural improvements, but was below target for i) allotments administered to standard and ii) grazing allotments analyzed and NEPA decisions signed. The rangeland management resource area is responsible for a significant number of infrastructure features for property and deferred maintenance on National Forest Service land. In FY 1999, rangeland specialists devoted their time to fiscal inventory, deferred maintenance, and the INFRA program. These were priority activities. Accomplishments were less than originally planned for those two indicators because of a shift in workload priorities to deferred maintenance inventories.

**Description of Actions and Schedules:** Deferred maintenance efforts will continue in FY 2000 and probably FY 2001. Fiscal inventory efforts should be completed in FY 2000.

**Current Fiscal Year Performance:** With continued emphasis on deferred maintenance and fiscal inventories, the Forest Service may not be able to achieve target levels for rangeland performance indicators.

**Program Evaluations:** None.

**Goal 2:** Provide Multiple Benefits for People within the Capabilities of Ecosystems.

**Objective 2.7:** Available mineral resources that comply with environmental and health standards.

### Key Performance Goals

Complete NEPA analyses in a timely manner, monitor operations, and ensure that mineral activities are done in an ecologically acceptable manner

Bonded and non-bonded non-energy operations processed (number)

**Target:** 10,905

**Actual:** 11,976

Energy operations processed (number)

**Target:** 375

**Actual:** 271

Customer satisfaction with oil and gas leasing, drilling, and production permit process

**Target:** NA

**Actual:** NA

**1999 Data:** All indicators except for the customer satisfaction survey use MAR data. No surveys were scheduled or conducted for FY 1999.

**Analysis of Results:** The Forest Service exceeded its target for non-energy operations processed but fell short of target for energy operations processed. All energy operations involve leased operations, and leasing declined in FY 1999.

**Program Evaluations:** None.

**Goal 2:** Provide Multiple Benefits for People within the Capabilities of Ecosystems.

**Objective 2.8:** Better resource management decisions based on the best available scientific and management information.

### Key Performance Goals

Acquire, analyze, and interpret information needed to evaluate implementation of land and resource management plans

Land and resource management plan monitoring and evaluation (number of plans)

**Target:** 125

**Actual:** 94

State of the region evaluation reports (number of reports)

**Target:** 9

**Actual:** 7

Interpret monitoring results and collect and analyze information needed to develop new land and resource management plans or revisions

Land and resource management plan revisions, new plans initiated

**Target:** 14

**Actual:** 9

Land and resource management plan revisions, new plans completed

**Target:** 2

**Actual:** 2

Develop and provide to managers scientific and technical information needed to, manage and sustain the forest and rangelands of the Nation

Technical reports (number)

**Target:** 1,526

**Actual:** 1,455

## Inventory field plots (percent)

**Target:** 6%**Actual:** 6% *Preliminary estimate*

**1999 Data:** All indicators use MAR data except for the last two. The indicator for number of technical reports is tracked in the Research Budget Attainment Information System, and the indicator for inventory field plots re-measured uses estimated data from the Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) program. The FIA program provides information needed to assess the health and sustainability of the Nation's forest. Data on the number and percent plots re-measured undergo a rigorous quality control and quality assurance procedure before being made available. Counts on plots are submitted in January, with a final analysis scheduled to be completed by February 15<sup>th</sup>. Actual data for the percent plots re-measured will be available then. In 1998, the Forest Service started issuing an Annual Business Report of the Forest Inventory and Analysis Program. See that publication for more details. Information on this program is also available over the Internet at [www.srsfia.usfs.msstate.edu/wo/wofia.htm](http://www.srsfia.usfs.msstate.edu/wo/wofia.htm).

**Analysis of Results:** Although funding and priorities for completion of Monitoring and Evaluation reports were a priority in FY 1999, reports were not issued for a total of 30 Forests in Regions, 1,3,4,5,6,8 and 9, and State of the Region reports were not issued for Regions 5 and 10. In general, the reason for failing to issue reports was due to funding being diverted for emergency or higher priority work. Plans are in place to complete missing reports during FY 2000.

Notices of Intent for Land and Resource Management Plans in Regions 2, 8, and 9 were not filed in order to prepare a more comprehensive proposal for public review. Additional pre-revision tasks were undertaken which should reduce the overall time involved in revision and provide the public with a more complete proposal.

**Description of Actions and Schedules:** All Forests and Regions will be required to issue reports in FY 2000 (covering the FY 1999 period). Those forests and regions that did not issue reports in FY 1999 (covering the FY 1998 period) will be required to issue those reports in FY 2000 as well. Monthly conference calls and a national meeting with Regional Monitoring and Evaluation coordinators will be used to stress compliance with these targets. In addition, the relationship of State of the Region reports to the GPRA Strategic Plan and Annual Performance Plan are being strengthened which should improve performance in FY 2000.

Targets for the five revisions not initiated in FY 1999 will be assigned in FY 2000. Notice of Intent have already been filed in early FY 2000 or will be filed shortly.

**Program Evaluations:** None.

**Goal 2:** Provide Multiple Benefits for People within the Capabilities of Ecosystems.

**Objective 2.9:** Provide a Safe Environment for the Public and Employees on National Forest System Lands.

### Key Performance Goals

Specific performance measures are not available for law enforcement at this time.

**Description of Actions and Schedules:** Several indicators of activity in law enforcement tracked on a year-end basis are not appropriate for distribution to the field as targets. The number of violation notices or "tickets" issued and the number of investigations are two such indicators. Many such measures are complex, and require careful interpretation. Efforts at developing accurate and meaningful performance indicators for law enforcement are ongoing at this time. Some of these will be included in the FY 2000 Revised Final/2001 Final Performance Plan.

**Goal 2:** Provide Multiple Benefits for People within the Capabilities of Ecosystems.

**Objective 2.10:** Provide for Special Uses and Protect National Forest System Land Title.

### Key Performance Goals

#### Survey, mark and maintain 10 percent of agency boundary lines to standard

New boundary marked to standard (miles)

**Target:** 1,050

**Actual:** 1,028

Rights-of-way acquired (cases)

**Target:** 342

**Actual:** 332

#### Be responsive to applications for new authorizations

Special use permits processed (number)

**Target:** 4,458

**Actual:** 5,984

#### Administer special use authorizations to meet public health and safety standards

Special use permits administered to standard (number)

**Target:** 19,457

**Actual:** 18,726

Hydropower license renewals completed (number)

**Target:** 90

**Actual:** TBD

#### Provide geometronics data for planning and management

Revised primary base series quads maintained to standard (number)

**Target:** 500



**Actual:** 697



Revised secondary base series quads maintained to standard (number)

**Target:** 20

**Actual:** 26

### Trend Data





	Actual					Targets		
	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	1999	2000	2001
New boundary line marked to standard	1,837	1,545	1,119	1,100	1,028	1,050	1,050	1,090
Rights-of-way cases	581	513	484	277	332	342	350	350
Special use permits processed	4,526	4,575	5,033	5,421	5,984	4,458	TBD	TBD
Special use permits administered to standard	15,447	24,137	20,996	14,926	18,726	19,457	6,470	6,500

**1999 Data:** The first four indicators for this objective use data from MAR, while the last three are tracked and monitored by National Forest System program staff.

Data are not available for hydropower license renewals completed.

**Analysis of Results:** The Forest Service did not meet its performance goal for boundary marked to standard and rights-of-way acquired. It also fell short of the target set for special use authorizations. It exceeded targets for special use permits and geometric data; therefore it achieved these goals.

Until recently, the Forest Service has not had an adequate system of tracking the administration of special use permits. This has led to difficulty in having accurate, verifiable data that can be used to establish targets. Furthermore, there is difficulty in interpreting current definitions of what "administered to standard" means. As a result, special uses program managers and staffs have not given the assignment of these targets and the reporting of accomplishments the attention they deserve.

**Description of Actions and Schedules:** With the establishment and implementation of the new "special uses data base" (SUDS) the agency will have the database needed to better track the administration of special use authorizations. Doing so will improve the way of tracking and setting targets for accomplishments. Establishing accountability standards and budgetary consequences associated with the accomplishment of these targets will result in units and managers giving them more attention and emphasis. Finally, the agency's planned implementation of cost recovery regulations will provide for more resources to administer a greater number of authorizations to standard than is currently being accomplished using a limited amount of appropriated funds. These changes should result in more reliable data; however, as a result of these changes, data for FY 2000 and beyond will not be comparable with data for earlier years.

The goal and targets for hydropower license renewals is currently under review.

**Program Evaluations:** GAO currently has an ongoing audit on the hydropower program. Also see objective 1.2 on land exchanges. No report has been issued yet.

**Goal 2:** Provide Multiple Benefits for People within the Capabilities of Ecosystems.

**Objective 2.11:** Provide for Safe Infrastructure and Access to National Forest System Lands.

**Key Performance Goals**

Maintain and restore existing infrastructure to protect capital investments where they provide safe, efficient and environmentally suitable support for agency activities and public use

System roads maintained to standard (percent of total)

**Target:** 18%

**Actual:** 26%

Investments in existing roads (miles)

**Target:** 2,774

**Actual:** 3,558

Bridges inspected as scheduled

**Target:** 90%

**Actual:** NA

Bridges constructed or maintained to improved sufficiency rating (points)

**Target:** +3 Compared to FY 1998

**Actual:** NA

Dams inspected as scheduled (percent)

**Target:** 95%

**Actual:** NA

Facilities reconstructed or replaced to meet current legal standards (projects completed)

**Target:** 32

**Actual:** 29

Customer survey will measure user satisfaction with recreation related facilities and access

**Target:** NA

**Actual:** NA

**1999 Data:** The first two indicators displayed above -- system roads maintained to standard and investments in existing roads -- use MAR data. The next three indicators -- bridges inspected as scheduled, bridges constructed or maintained to improved sufficiency rating (points), and dams inspected as scheduled -- use data from the INFRA database. The Engineering program tracks the next indicator -- facilities reconstructed or replaced to meet current legal standards. The last indicator uses data from customer satisfaction surveys. No survey was scheduled for or conducted during FY 1999.

**Analysis of Results:** The Forest Service exceeded targets set for the two indicators for road standards and investments. Data were not available for the bridge and dam indicators -- see the discussion on the INFRA database on page 8. The Forest Service did not meet its target for number of facilities reconstructed or replaced to meet current legal standards.

The current indicator for system roads maintained to standard does not validly capture road conditions due to differences in how road standards are interpreted. Consequently, a new indicator will be adopted beginning in FY 2000 that uses a condition rating index system. The new rating system should reduce subjective ambiguity in how roads are rated and therefore provide a more reliable indicator for the condition of national forest system roads.

**Description of Actions and Schedules:** Work to generate the necessary reports from the INFRA database should be completed during FY 2000. At that time, data for FY 1999 as well as FY 2000 should be available.

**Current Fiscal Year Performance:** Data on past and current year performance will become available as soon as the INFRA database is complete. At that time, targets and goals will be evaluated based on those data.

**Goal 3:** Ensure Organizational Effectiveness.

Goal 3, Ensuring Organizational Effectiveness differs from Goals 1 and 2 by articulating management initiatives rather than objectives. The primary difference between the two is that management initiatives are not generally related to differing program budget levels. In other words, increases or decreases in specific program funding levels may have little effect on the performance indicators for the management initiatives under Goal 3 Ensuring Organizational Effectiveness. Additionally, several performance indicators used with the management initiatives are qualitative, rather than quantitative.

**Management Initiative 3.1:** An innovative, people-oriented work environment and workforce that is representative of society as a whole and that services all customers equally.

**Key Performance Goals**

<u>Minorities, women, and persons with disabilities in the workforce (percent of total)</u>	
<b>Target:</b>	NA
<b>Actual:</b>	48.7%
<u>Minorities, women, and persons with disabilities in leadership positions (percent of positions GS-13 and above)</u>	
<b>Target:</b>	NA
<b>Actual:</b>	34.5%
<u>Opportunities for increased participation (number served)</u>	
Youth Conservation Corps	
<b>Target:</b>	NA
<b>Actual:</b>	717
Job Corps	
<b>Target:</b>	NA
<b>Actual:</b>	8,623
Senior Community Service Employment Program	
<b>Target:</b>	NA
<b>Actual:</b>	5,221
<u>Implementation of USDA civil rights initiative (percent of related indicators)</u>	
<b>Target:</b>	NA
<b>Actual:</b>	78.4%
<u>Employee participation in CIP survey (percent of workforce)</u>	
<b>Target:</b>	65%
<b>Actual:</b>	46%

**Trend Data**

	1999 Actual	Target	
		2000	2001
Minorities, women, and persons with disabilities in the workforce: % total	48.7%	48.9%	TBD
Minorities, women, and persons with disabilities in leadership positions: % in positions GS-13 and above	34.5%	35.6%	TBD
Youth Conservation Corps: number served	717	650	700
Job Corps: number served	8,623	8,800	8,850
Senior Community Service Employment Program: number served	5,221	5,500	5,500
Employee participation in CIP survey: % of workforce	46%	NA	TBD

**1999 Data:** Data quality and reliability for the performance measures are expected to be high and there are no apparent data limitations, with the following observation. The first two indicators include persons with disabilities in the data pools. However, the number of persons with disabilities not already included in the data for either women or minorities cannot be differentiated in the source data, FOCUS reports HCTL2RNO parts I and II. Consequently, the percentage figures are thought to be slightly lower than the actual cases.

The first two performance indicators measure the agency's efforts to fully implement multicultural awareness and management competencies within the organization, with particular emphasis on leadership positions.

The next three indicators (numbers served under Youth Conservation Corps, Job Corps, and Senior Community Service Employment Program) are used to measure the Forest Service commitment to integrating the needs and values of Americans differing with respect to age distribution.

The indicator for implementation of USDA civil rights initiative (% of total related indicators) arises from the 1997 USDA Civil Rights Action Team recommendations. The Team presented 92 recommendations to the Secretary of Agriculture to improve employee and customer relations and program delivery throughout the Department. Many of the recommendations are applicable to the Forest Service and work is ongoing to implement those recommendations.

The final indicator under Management Initiative 3.1 involves the percentage of the total workforce participating in the Continuous Improvement Process (CIP) survey. The agency uses this process to measure employee satisfaction in areas including communication, human resource management, job satisfaction, organizational management, service and quality, and supervision. By establishing a baseline developed from the 1997 CIP survey, subsequent surveys identify changes in areas needing improvement. Ultimately, an improved work environment will increase employee productivity. The premise is that a more productive workforce will be more effective, efficient, and responsive.

**Analysis of Results:** With only one of seven indicators having a target, the extent of quantifiable progress being made toward accomplishment of management initiative 3.1 cannot be determined.

The percentage of minorities, women, and persons with disabilities in the workforce has remained stable compared with prior years. As of September 30, 1999, there were 13,741 minorities, women, and persons with disabilities in permanent positions out of a total 28,208 permanent positions in the agency.

As of September 30, 1999, there were 1106 minorities, women, and persons with disabilities in leadership positions at grade GS-13 and above out of 3207 total agency employees in those permanent positions. The percentage of those employees in leadership positions in grades GS-13 and above has shown an increase from prior years.

The number of persons served in the Youth Conservation Corps, Job Corps, and the Senior Community Service Employment Program has remained relatively stable during the past three years, although the latter two programs have experienced slight enrollment decreases from the prior year.

Implementation of the USDA civil rights initiative has been ongoing since 1997. In October, 1997, there were 37 civil rights recommendations for which implementation was in progress within the Forest Service. As of September 30, 1999, 29 have been implemented, with progress continuing on the remaining 8 recommendations.

Only the last performance indicator had a target against which to measure the current year accomplishment. A total of 36,804 CIP surveys were distributed to agency employees, with 16,733 surveys returned by the due date. The rate of employees participating in the continuous improvement process survey was 46% compared with a target of 65%. Participation rates in fiscal years 1997 and 1998 were 58% and 65% respectively, both higher than the rate for fiscal year (FY) 1999.

**Description of Actions and Schedules:** The reports used as the data source for the first and second performance indicators do not differentiate the number of employees with disabilities from other categories. More comprehensive reports would be required to improve the accuracy of the data presented for both measures where employees with disabilities are included in the percentages.

The target for the employee participation in the continuous improvement process (CIP) survey was not met. The agency is reassessing the approach used in circulating surveys and encouraging greater

participation by focusing on providing more timely feedback and results to participants. Based on the findings from the FY 1999 CIP survey, a team of National Leadership Committee members will meet during the week of February 21, 2000, to design and develop the agency's first National CIP Action Plan. The next scheduled CIP survey will be conducted in FY 2001.

**Current Fiscal Year Performance:** Performance levels accomplished in FY 1999 would not have an effect on planned performance levels in FY 2000. The availability of meaningful data, consistency of definitions, and utility for policy makers are factors that will determine which performance measures will be used for annual performance reporting or longer-term monitoring.

**Goal 3:** Ensure Organizational Effectiveness.

**Management Initiative 3.2** All customers receive better service.

### Key Performance Goals

<u>Offer to all customers, contractors, suppliers and vendors opportunity to conduct electronic financial transactions</u>	
<b>Target:</b>	Emphasis on full implementation of IBM system.
<b>Actual:</b>	Electronic payments by agency available.
<u>Establish internal enterprise teams to improve management efficiency of National Forests in California</u>	
<b>Target:</b>	Evaluation of initial efforts.
<b>Actual:</b>	Evaluations completed.
<u>Offer toll-free telephone, world-wide-web, and automated applications to all permittees and applicants of most frequently requested special use permits</u>	
<b>Target:</b>	Emphasis on full implementation of IBM system.
<b>Actual:</b>	All but toll-free telephone access is available.
<u>Improve service to public land users by providing one-stop shopping for information, permits, and other frequently requested over the counter products and services at BLM and Forest Service facilities</u>	
<b>Target:</b>	"Service first" plans completed for each BLM district and FS forest.
<b>Actual:</b>	"Service first" plans completed on a state-wide basis.
<u>Provide an integrated nationwide outdoor recreation information system that gives all Americans quick and easy access to the BLM, Park Service, and Forest Service, including recreation use permits and reservations</u>	
<b>Target:</b>	Evaluate, revise, and improve system.
<b>Actual:</b>	Access to the system is available on the internet at the interactive web site featuring user improvements made in FY 1999.
<u>Customer satisfaction surveys completed (number)</u>	
<b>Target:</b>	5
<b>Actual:</b>	5
<u>Follow-up analyses</u>	
<b>Target:</b>	NA
<b>Actual:</b>	24

**1999 Data:** The quality and reliability of the data/information provided for the performance measures are expected to be high and there are no apparent data limitations.

The first indicator under Management Initiative 3.2 is to offer all customers, contractors, suppliers and vendors the opportunity to conduct electronic financial transactions. In large part, this business practice entails electronic funds transfer by the Forest Service as payment for products and services received. Past agency payment practices primarily involved mailing paper checks that took longer, was more expensive, and less secure. Agency-wide use of the new IBM computer system is intended to further attainment of this indicator. In FY 1999, the IBM system became available agency-wide and electronic payment transactions were offered to all customers, contractors, suppliers, and vendors.

The second indicator involves establishing internal enterprise teams to improve management efficiency of National Forests in California and to evaluate the initial efforts. An evaluation of initial efforts was completed as planned in FY 1999.

The third indicator measures how successful the Forest Service would be making available toll-free telephone access, a world-wide web page, and automated application forms to all permittees and applicants of the most frequently requested special-use permits. All but the toll-free telephone access was completed in FY 1999. A world wide web page was created and available for use, with electronic application forms available from the web page. The IBM system was fully implemented agency-wide as well.

The fourth indicator would measure improvement in public service by instituting "one-stop shopping" opportunities to the public who need access to both the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and the Forest Service. "Service First" plans are to be completed for each BLM District office and Forest Supervisor's office.

The fifth indicator is to evaluate, revise and improve a system to provide integrated, nationwide, outdoor recreation information. The intent is to provide all Americans quick and easy access to the BLM, Park Service, and Forest Service recreation use permits and reservations. As a result of these efforts, the web site [www.recreation.gov](http://www.recreation.gov) was revised during FY 1999 to feature user improvements.

The sixth indicator involves measuring customer satisfaction with the quality of service provided by the Forest Service. Customer service surveys are intended to measure levels of public satisfaction with a wide range of agency programs. Results of the surveys will allow the agency to better respond to opportunities for improvements.

The last indicator under Management Initiative 3.2 entails follow-up analyses of customer satisfaction surveys.

**Analysis of Results:** The Forest Service met its FY 1999 performance goal for this management initiative. The accomplishments described in the table above, when compared with their targets, indicate that progress is being made toward attainment of management initiative 3.2 that all customers receive better service. Six of the seven performance measures had planned targets that were essentially accomplished. The seventh measure, follow-up analyses of customer satisfaction surveys, had no target although 24 follow-up analyses were reported for customer surveys conducted in prior years.

**Description of Actions and Schedules:** No actions or schedules have been identified for measures within this management initiative. One item of the second performance measure, offering toll-free telephone access, was not accomplished due to projected high costs and will not be pursued in the future.

**Current Fiscal Year Performance:** Actual performance levels in FY 1999 are not expected to influence estimated levels of performance in FY 2000.

**Goal 3:** Ensure Organizational Effectiveness.

**Management Initiative 3.3:** Integrated information systems, data structures and information management processes in place to support the agency's mission.

**Key Performance Goals**

<u>IBM system users (percent of employees)</u>	
<b>Target:</b>	100%
<b>Actual:</b>	100%
<u>Mission critical systems tested and found to be Y2K complaints</u>	
<b>Target:</b>	100%
<b>Actual:</b>	100%

**1999 Data:** Data/information is expected to be reliable and without apparent limitations.

The first indicator for Management Initiative 3.3 measures agency efforts to have all employees using IBM equipment and systems. The new IBM system will provide not only the current administrative applications, but also a Geographic Information System (GIS) capability allowing greater and quicker manipulation of resource information crucial to decision making.

The second indicator deals with the mission critical systems tested and found to be Y2K compliant to support the agency's mission.

**Analysis of Results:** The forest service met its FY 1999 performance goal for this management initiative. Accomplishment of both performance measures is significant in meeting the management initiative. The agency has transitioned to the IBM platform successfully, and has tested and found mission critical systems to be Y2K compliant.

**Description of Actions and Schedules:** No actions or schedules are required as both measures have been met. This management initiative will require development of new indicators if continued in future performance measurement as part of both the annual Performance Plan and Report.

**Current Fiscal Year Performance:** No assessment has been made regarding actual performance levels in FY 1999 and whether there would be effects to estimated performance levels in FY 2000.

**Goal 3:** Ensure Organizational Effectiveness

**Management Initiative 3.4:** A sound financial system which supports resource decisions with timely, accurate information and financial expertise

**Key Performance Goals**

<u>FFIS implemented</u>	
<b>Target:</b>	3 pilot units
<b>Actual:</b>	3 pilot units
<u>Real property inventory completed</u>	
<b>Target:</b>	Yes
<b>Actual:</b>	Partial
<u>Timber sales accounting system implemented</u>	
<b>Target:</b>	Yes
<b>Actual:</b>	Yes

Financial management reports developed showing obligations direct/indirect costs and performance indicator costs

**Target:** Prototype completed

**Actual:** Partial

Unqualified audit opinion

**Target:** No

**Actual:** Audit not yet completed.

Audit items from the Secretary's Management Report eliminated

**Target:** No

**Actual:** Partial

Delinquent debts referred to Treasury for offset and cross-servicing (percent)

**Target:** NA

**Actual:** NA

**1999 Data:** The quality and reliability of the data/information being reported are expected to be high. A data limitation prevents reporting the percentage of delinquent debts referred to the Treasury for offset and cross-servicing.

The first indicator addresses continued implementation in three pilot units of the agency's new Foundation Financial Information System (FFIS). The units involved include the Alaska Region, the Pacific Northwest Region, and the Pacific Northwest Research Station.

The second indicator measures the status of completing required modules of the real property inventory.

The third indicator focuses on implementation of the timber sale accounting system.

The fourth indicator addresses the status of developing prototype financial management reports showing obligations, direct/indirect costs and performance indicator costs.

The fifth indicator reflects obtaining an unqualified audit opinion for the agency's FY 2000 financial audit report to be issued by March 2001. Inclusion of this indicator in the FY 1999 Performance Plan and in the Report was done with the understanding that the target would not be achieved this fiscal year.

The sixth indicator focuses on eliminating Forest Service audit items from the Secretary's Management Report.

The seventh indicator is intended to measure the percentage of eligible delinquent debts owed to the Forest Service that were referred to the Treasury for offset and cross-servicing under provisions of the Debt Collection Improvement Act of 1996.

**Analysis of Results:** The first performance measure had a quantitative target that was achieved as the three pilot units continued implementation of the Foundation Financial Information System (FFIS) during FY 1999. Beginning October 1, 1999, the Forest Service implemented use of FFIS agency-wide.

The second measure, completion of a real property inventory, was met for individual assets and was certified as accomplished. There is an ongoing effort to inventory newly identified property and pooled assets during FY 2000.

The third measure, implementation of the timber sales accounting system, was met.

The fourth measure entailed development of prototype financial management reports showing obligations, direct/indirect costs, and performance indicator costs. While reports showing obligations were available in FY 1999, reports on direct/indirect costs and performance indicator costs have only

become available in FY 2000. Reports are available only for some of the quantitative performance indicators.

An unqualified audit opinion has not been received for the Forest Service financial statements, nor was one anticipated during FY 1999. Accomplishment of this fifth measure is contingent on an audit by the Office of Inspector General that has not yet been completed.

The sixth measure addressing elimination of audit items was partially completed. Review of the 21 open audits at the beginning of FY 1999 indicates three audits were completed. Ongoing efforts continue to address the remaining open audits and the Forest Service submits progress reports to the Department of Agriculture twice annually.

The seventh measure concerning the percent of eligible delinquent debts referred to the Treasury did not have an assigned target. The Forest Service does not currently have a reporting system that provides the necessary data with which to calculate the percentage of eligible delinquent debts referred to the Treasury for offset and cross-servicing during FY 1999. The existing report, known as Schedule 9, will require formatting and content modifications to provide the required data.

Progress toward accomplishing management initiative 3.4 is being made, although only two of the performance indicators met their respective target.

**Description of Actions and Schedules:** In FY 2000, the entire agency is using FFIS. While the real property items identified for inventory in FY 1999 were done, real property inventory will be a continuing effort. Development of financial management reports will also be ongoing in FY 2000. Attainment of an unqualified audit opinion and elimination of Forest Service audit items from the Secretary's Management report will continue to be a focus, as will referral of eligible delinquent debts to the Treasury.

**Current Fiscal Year Performance:** As described above, those performance measures not accomplished in FY 1999 will be part of the Forest Service continued performance efforts in FY 2000.

**Goal 3:** Ensure Organizational Effectiveness.

**Management Initiative 3.5:** An effective and efficient administrative organization that supports the Forest Service Mission.

**1999 Data:** There are no performance indicators identified for this Management Initiative.

**Analysis of Results:** NA

**Description of Actions and Schedules:** Decisions regarding whether this management initiative will be included in future Forest Service Performance Plans will depend on revisions to the Strategic Plan that will be made during FY 2000.

**Current Fiscal Year Performance:** NA

## **APPENDIX A:**

### **Performance Indicators Discontinued or Modified In the FY 2000/FY 2001 Performance Plan**

This appendix shows how performance indicators in the 1999 Performance Report have been modified, combined, or discontinued in the FY 2000/FY 2001 Revised Final Performance Report. It shows the indicators as they are organized under the objectives in the FY 1999 Performance Report. For each objective, this appendix only shows those performance indicators that were discontinued from or have been modified in the FY 2000/FY 2001 Revised Final Performance Plan.

In most cases where indicators have been combined in or discontinued from the FY 2000/FY 2001 Performance Plan, data on the indicators will continue to be collected for other purposes.

In addition to the indicators listed below, several customer survey measures included in the FY 1999 Performance Report and previous versions of the Performance Plan are not included in the FY 2000/FY 2001 Revised Final Performance Plan. The Forest Service remains committed to ensuring a high degree of customer satisfaction. Indicators and measures were not reported here, however, because the Forest Service is still working on a systematic plan of measuring customer satisfaction and setting appropriate targets to meet this commitment.

#### **Objective 1.1: Ensure Healthy and Diverse Aquatic Ecosystems**

Three performance indicators have been discontinued:

- Abandoned Mine Land (AML) watershed initiative activities
- Bonded non-energy/energy operations administered to standard: number of operations
- Bonded non-energy/energy operations administered to standard: percent of operations

#### **Objective 1.2: Ensure Healthy and Diverse Forestlands**

Four performance indicators have been discontinued:

- Non-industrial Private Forest (NIPF) Stewardship Management Plans (number)
- Legacy Project Acquisition (number of projects)
- Statewide assessments of needs (number of states)
- Value of FEPP equipment loaned to States (millions of dollars)

Acres covered by NIPF Stewardship Management Plans and acres acquired under legacy project acquisitions are still included in the performance plan.

#### **Objective 1.3: Ensure Healthy and Diverse Rangelands**

Two performance indicators have been discontinued:

- Nonstructural range improvements completed (acres)
- Rangelands monitored for progress toward desired condition in Allotment Management Plans

#### **Objective 1.4: Respond to Hazardous Substance Sites**

Three performance indicators have been discontinued:

- Hazardous substance sites characterized
- Hazardous substance site cleanups completed
- Watershed or major abandoned mine land (AML) site cleanup actions initiated under CERCLA

#### **Objective 1.5: Protect Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive (TE&S) Species**

Two performance indicators have been combined into a single indicator. The two indicators in the FY 1999 Performance Report are:

Conservation agreements and strategies (number of sensitive aquatic and terrestrial species)  
 Approved and implemented recovery plans (number of listed aquatic and terrestrial species)

The new indicator that combines these two in the FY 2000/FY 2001 Performance Plan is:  
 Conservation agreements and strategies and recovery plans (signed agreements)

**Objective 1.6: Develop Scientific and Management Information to Support Sustainable Ecosystem Management**

Three performance indicators have been combined into a single measure. The three indicators in the FY 1999 Performance Report are (all use number of assessments as their measurement unit):

Ecosystem assessments completed: Ecoregion (Domain/Division/Province) scale  
 Ecosystem assessments completed: Eco-subregion (Section/River Basin/Sub-River Basin) scale  
 Ecosystem assessments completed: Landscape/Watershed scale

The new indicator that combines these three in the FY 2000/FY 2001 Performance Plan is:  
 Assessments completed (number)

A single indicator has replaced the following eleven indicators:

Terrestrial Ecological Unit Inventories: Eco-subregion (Section/Subsection) scale (acres)  
 Terrestrial Ecological Unit Inventories: Landscape scale (acres)  
 Terrestrial Ecological Unit Inventories: Land unit scale (acres)  
 Aquatic Ecological Unit Inventories: Riverine Valley Segment (miles)  
 Aquatic Ecological Unit Inventories: Riverine Stream Reach/Channel Unit (miles)  
 Aquatic Ecological Unit Inventories: Lacustrine Lake Type Zone (acres)  
 Aquatic Ecological Unit Inventories: Lacustrine Lake Zone/Site Scale (acres)  
 Biological Inventories: Forest Resource Inventories (acres)  
 Biological Inventories: Rangeland Resource Inventories (acres)  
 Biological Inventories: Wildlife Habitat Inventories (acres)  
 Biological Inventories: TE&S Species Inventories (acres)  
 Human Dimensions Heritage Inventories (acres)

The detail contained in the eleven inventory measures will continue to be collected. However, a new indicator replaces these in the FY 2000/FY 2001 Performance Plan:

Above-project inventory completed (million acres)

The following indicator from the FY 1999 Performance Plan has been combined with Technical Reports shown under objective 2.8 and assumed into a broader indicator:  
 Scientific papers (number)

The new indicator in the FY 2000/FY 2001 Performance Plan is:  
 Number of Research Products, Tools and Technologies Transferred to Users

The following indicator has been discontinued:  
 Air Quality Related Values Inventoried/Monitored

**Objective 1.7: Protect Natural Wilderness Ecosystem Related Values**

The following indicator has been discontinued:  
 Wilderness covered by approved fire plans (acres)

**Objective 2.1: Provide Quality Recreation Experiences**

The following indicator from the FY 1999 Performance Plan has been modified and assumed into a broader indicator:

Trails reconstructed to standard (miles)

The new indicator in the FY 2000/FY 2001 Performance Plan is:  
Trails maintained and improved (miles)

**Objective 2.2: Provide for Heritage Resource Education and Use**

The following indicator has been discontinued:  
Heritage sites evaluated (number of sites)

**Objective 2.3: Support Improved Urban Environments**

The following indicators have been discontinued:  
Technical assistance to communities (number)  
Training provided (million hours)  
Volunteer assistance generated (million hours)

**Objective 2.4: Support Healthy and Diverse Rural Communities**

The following indicators have been discontinued:  
Communities using locally-based measurement systems (number)  
Assistance to tribal and minority communities (number)

**Objective 2.5: Provide for Sustainable Yield of Wood and Forest Products**

The following indicator has been discontinued:  
Increased use of underutilized species (million cubic feet)

**Objective 2.6: Provide for Sustainable Grazing Use**

The following indicators have been discontinued:  
Range Structural Improvements (number)  
Allotments administered to standard (number)  
Grazing allotments analyzed and NEPA decisions signed (number)

**Objective 2.7: Support Ecologically Sound Mineral Production**

The following indicators have been combined into a single indicator (both use number of operations as their measurement unit):  
Bonded and non-bonded non-energy operations processed  
Energy operations processed

The new indicator that combines these two in the FY 2000/FY 2001 Performance Plan is:  
Minerals non-energy/energy operations processed (number)

In addition, the following indicator has been added:  
Minerals non-energy/energy operations administered to standard (number)

**Objective 2.8: Develop Scientific and Management Information to Support Improved Natural Resource Management and Use**

The following indicators have been combined into a single indicator (both use number of reports):  
Land and resource management plan monitoring and evaluation  
State of the region evaluation reports

The new indicator that combines these two in the FY 2000/FY 2001 Performance Plan is:  
Scheduled monitoring reports (number)

The following indicators have been combined into a single indicator (both use number of plans):  
 Land and resource management plan (LRMPs) revisions, new plans initiated  
 Land and resource management plan revisions, new plans completed

The following indicator in the FY 2000/FY 2001 Performance Plan combines these two indicators:  
 Forests and grasslands initiating or completing new LRMPs or Revisions (number)

The following performance indicator has been modified:  
 Inventory field plots remeasured (percent)

The new indicator that replaces it in the FY 2000/FY 2001 Performance Plan is:  
 Percent of Forest Land Covered by the Annual FIA and FHM Programs

The following indicator from the FY 1999 Performance Plan has been combined with Scientific Papers shown under objective 1.6 and assumed into a broader indicator:  
 Technical Reports (number)

The new indicator in the FY 2000/FY 2001 Performance Plan is:  
 Number of Research Products, Tools and Technologies Transferred to Users

**Objective 2.10: Provide for Special Uses and Protect National Forest System Land Title**

The following indicators have been discontinued:  
 Hydropower license renewals (number)  
 Revised primary base series quads maintained to standard (number)  
 Revised secondary base series quads maintained to standard (number)

**Objective 2.11: Provide for Safe Infrastructure and Access to National Forest System Lands**

The following indicators have been modified in the FY 2000/FY 2001 Performance Plan:  
 System roads maintained to standard (miles)  
 Investments in existing roads (miles)

They have been replaced with:  
 Road condition index rating  
 Roads without critical deferred maintenance needs (percent)  
 Roads open to all intended traffic (percent)  
 Accident frequency on roads managed and maintained for passenger cars